

Global Politics And Security Intimidations

Posted on January 8, 2020

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/global-politics-and-security-intimidations/>

Introduction

Global security after September 11, 2001 cannot be understood through terrorism alone. The attacks demonstrated the capacity of a transnational network to inflict mass casualties and reshaped intelligence, border security, military planning, surveillance, and debate over when states may use force. In the years that followed, Afghanistan and Iraq exposed both the reach and the limits of counterterrorism strategy, while relations with Pakistan showed how states can cooperate against one threat while disagreeing over others. By 2026, the security environment is broader still. Terrorism remains a concern, but it coexists with interstate war, nuclear modernization, cyber operations, coercive economics, disinformation, climate-related disruption, attacks on civilian infrastructure, and renewed major-power competition. SIPRI's 2026 assessment reports growing reliance on nuclear weapons and heightened escalation risks, illustrating how security dilemmas have expanded beyond the post-9/11 framework. A durable strategy therefore requires more than military power. Intelligence, diplomacy, law, resilience, arms control, public institutions, and protection of civil liberties all influence whether governments reduce threats or unintentionally create new sources of insecurity.

From 9/11 to Preemption and Prolonged War

The first post-9/11 security shift concerned the perceived danger of waiting for an attack to become imminent. Traditional deterrence seeks to prevent aggression by threatening retaliation, while preemption refers to action against an attack judged imminent and preventive war seeks to remove a potential future danger before imminence exists. The distinction matters because preventive logic gives governments wider discretion to act on uncertain intelligence. The 2001 intervention in Afghanistan initially targeted al-Qaeda and the Taliban government that hosted its leadership, but the mission expanded into counterinsurgency, institution building, and development before the Taliban returned to power in 2021. Iraq presented a different problem. The 2003 invasion was justified partly through claims about weapons of mass destruction that were not borne out by the stockpiles found after the invasion. Subsequent instability and sectarian violence illustrated the danger of assuming that removing a regime will automatically produce durable security. These cases demonstrate that operational success against a government or armed organization is different from establishing a legitimate and stable political settlement.

Terrorism, Partnerships, and Human Rights

Terrorism remains adaptive because organizations, local affiliates, and individuals can use violence, online propaganda, financing networks, and loosely connected communities without reproducing the exact structure of al-Qaeda in 2001. Counterterrorism therefore combines intelligence, law enforcement, financial controls, international cooperation, border measures, community prevention, and in some circumstances military action. Pakistan illustrates the complexity of partnership. Geography, nuclear capability, intelligence, and influence in Afghanistan made cooperation strategically important, while disagreement over militant sanctuaries, drone strikes, sovereignty, and regional priorities produced persistent mistrust. Such relationships show why states should not be treated as unitary actors with one permanent motive. Civilian governments, militaries, intelligence agencies, parties, and local networks may pursue different interests. Counterterrorism also creates human-rights risks. Torture, unlawful detention, discriminatory profiling, or indefinite emergency powers can damage legitimacy, produce unreliable intelligence, and alienate communities whose cooperation is necessary. Effective security institutions need authority, but exceptional powers should be legally defined, reviewable, proportionate, and constrained so that protection from violence does not become justification for abandoning the principles governments claim to defend.

Nuclear Risk and the Return of Interstate Competition

Current security debates increasingly involve state power and nuclear escalation rather than only non-state violence. SIPRI reported that all nine nuclear-armed states continued strengthening their arsenals during 2025 and estimated a global inventory of approximately 12,187 nuclear weapons in January 2026, with roughly 4,012 deployed with operational forces (SIPRI, 2026). These figures matter because modernization is occurring while arms-control arrangements and strategic dialogue have weakened. Interstate war also changes the structure of risk. Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, continuing tensions in East Asia, conflicts in the Middle East, and the 2025 India-Pakistan fighting have reinforced concern about escalation between states possessing large militaries or nuclear capabilities. Deterrence may reduce incentives for deliberate attack, but it cannot eliminate miscalculation, accident, cyber interference, or escalation from conventional conflict. Security policy therefore requires crisis communication, arms control, verification, and diplomatic channels even between adversaries. Treating every rivalry as an existential struggle can make compromise politically harder and increase the chance that leaders interpret defensive measures as preparations for attack.

Cyber, Disinformation, and Economic Interdependence

Cyber operations and economic coercion allow states and non-state actors to impose costs below the threshold of conventional war. Cyber intrusions can steal intelligence, disrupt hospitals or energy systems, compromise supply chains, or establish access that might be used in a later crisis. Attribution can be uncertain, which complicates retaliation and increases the importance of resilience, backups, secure software, trained personnel, and rapid recovery. Disinformation creates a different vulnerability by exploiting social divisions and weakening trust, but democratic responses must avoid turning security agencies into authorities over permissible political opinion. Transparent communication, independent journalism, media literacy, and disclosure of influence operations are safer foundations than broad censorship. Economic interdependence also creates leverage through sanctions, export controls, energy supply, finance, investment screening, and control of critical technologies. These tools can offer alternatives to military force, yet broad restrictions may harm civilians, encourage evasion, or accelerate rival blocs. Resilience therefore means diversification, strategic reserves, allied coordination, and careful assessment of dependencies rather than complete economic separation, which is often costly and unrealistic.

Climate, Human Security, and Layered Response

Human security broadens the concept of protection by recognizing that pandemics, food insecurity, displacement, climate extremes, and infrastructure failure can threaten life and political stability even when no enemy army crosses a border. Climate change does not automatically cause war, but heat, drought, flooding, crop failure, and displacement can intensify existing inequality or competition in places where institutions are already weak. Treating these problems primarily as military threats can be counterproductive because health systems, social protection, infrastructure, water management, and development often provide more appropriate tools. A layered security strategy therefore assigns different instruments to different risks. Intelligence identifies specific threats; law enforcement investigates networks; diplomacy reduces tensions; military forces deter or respond to armed attack; public health manages biological hazards; and resilient infrastructure limits disruption. Arms control, accountable governance, development, and community prevention address conditions that force cannot resolve. Success should be measured not merely through enemies killed or operations conducted, but through reduced violence, lower civilian harm, stronger institutions, and whether political settlements endure after immediate crises have passed.

Conclusion

The post-9/11 era demonstrates why security policy must distinguish urgent threats from uncertain future dangers and military capability from political success. Terrorism required stronger intelligence

and international cooperation, but Afghanistan and Iraq showed how quickly limited objectives can expand and how preventive logic can magnify the consequences of faulty assumptions. In 2026, the security agenda is even more complex. Nuclear modernization, interstate conflict, cyber operations, economic coercion, disinformation, climate stress, and attacks on civilian infrastructure interact with continuing terrorist threats. SIPRI's assessment of heightened nuclear risk underscores the importance of arms control and crisis communication alongside deterrence. No single instrument can manage this environment. Durable security depends on disciplined evidence, lawful use of force, diplomacy, resilient institutions, credible alliances, public health capacity, and protections for human rights. The central lesson is not that governments should always act earlier or more aggressively. It is that irreversible power should be used only after careful assessment of evidence, legal authority, likely consequences, alternatives, and the political conditions required for a stable outcome.

References

- Landau, M. J., et al. (2004). Deliver us from evil: The effects of mortality salience and reminders of 9/11 on support for President George W. Bush. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(9), 1136-1150.
- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (2004). *The 9/11 Commission report*.
- Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2003). *In the wake of 9/11: The psychology of terror*. American Psychological Association.
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2026). *SIPRI Yearbook 2026*.
- United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*.
- United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism. (2026). *United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*.
- Wright, L. (2006). *The looming tower: Al-Qaeda and the road to 9/11*. Alfred A. Knopf.